

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION / MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES 1 13	
Initials & Control Number: WTO/042393							
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. N66604-04-R-0199-0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 2004 FEB 17		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. N66604-3282-21Q3-900		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY Commercial Acquisition Department, Building 11 Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division, Newport Code 591 Simonpietri Drive Newport, RI 02841-1708		CODE N66604		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) 		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)				(X)		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N66604-04-R-0199	
				X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 17 FEB 04	
						10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 3 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
(X) A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO : (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return 3 copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)							
<p>The purpose of this amendment is to (1) respond to vendors' questions generated by a site visit conducted from January 5 through January 16, 2004 and (2) provide a list of site visit attendees.</p> <p>- CONTINUED NEXT PAGE -</p>							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
POINT OF CONTACT: Tel: 401-832-1640 Fax: 401-832-4820 E-mail: oliverwt@npt.nuwc.navy.mil							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR				15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
BY _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)						BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	
						16C. DATE SIGNED	

(1) Site Visit Question and Answers:

Note – not all questions received after the site visit are answered in this document. Some of the questions involve research or compiling documents which is in process. Another amendment to the solicitation will be issued to answer the remaining site questions as well as any questions generated by the solicitation.

AUTEC site visit Questions:

1. When did the aviation assets amortization start and what amortization schedule is used.

Plane 1 – acquired Aug, 1992 for \$4,754,774.74
 Residual value = \$1,485,867.11
 Depreciated over 240 months
 Book at start of new Contract = \$2,704,764.69
 Yearly depreciation = \$164,345.74

Plane 2 – acquired Aug, 1992 for \$4,728,712.61
 Residual value = \$1,477,722.69
 Depreciated over 240 months
 Book at start of new Contract = \$2,710,389.70
 Yearly depreciation = \$162,549.50

HELO 1 – acquired June, 1994 for \$2,830,000
 Residual value = \$727,679.75
 Depreciation over 144 months
 Book at start of new Contract = \$940,433.33
 Monthly Depreciation = \$15,196.68

Scheduled last date of Depreciation = May, 2006

HELO 1 – acquired January, 1995 for \$2,590,000
 Residual value = \$647,500.00
 Depreciation over 144 months
 Book at start of new Contract = \$768,906.25
 Monthly Depreciation = \$ 13,489.58

Scheduled last date of Depreciation = December, 2006

Terminal – acquired December, 1995 for \$1,100,176.80
 Residual value = \$0.00
 Depreciation over 168 months
 Book at start of new Contract = \$454,928.70
 Monthly Depreciation = \$ 6,690.13
 Scheduled last date of Depreciation = November, 2010

2. Can additional site visits be made by proposed bidders to view assets that do not require escorts (i.e. to look at the meal/lodging/retail facilities).

No

3. In order for the bidder to provide the most appropriate improvement initiatives to the government IAW L34X I.D., the bidders need more descriptive information on the operations and program management software programs that are used to collect costs and manage work loads and schedules. Please provide information or a link to a documents library that will provide this information.

AUTEC currently employs PeopleSoft ERP software to track Finances, Human Resources, and Purchasing information. This system is currently in production mode, having been implemented in Jan, 2004. All financial and personnel workload factors are derived from this software. The bidders are encouraged to use this software, as they see fit, to provide the data and information they require to manage the contract.

4. AUTEC PB SOW Paragraph 1.1.2.11 indicates that the contractor must perform IAW ODs, OCDs, APPs and SOPs. Please provide a copy of any AUTEC SOPs that are directive documents on the bidder's proposal.

Applicable documents are located at: <http://www.npt.nuwc.navy.mil/contract/> SOP's are specific to government and are not directed to the contractor.

5. The NUWC-provided AUTEC information includes the wording: "Current contract specification will be the basis for the follow-on contract." (File date 9/19/02), since the AUTEC PWS provides material extracted from that specification. Does the PWS consist of all contract-specified information required to provide the AUTEC M&O services? YES If so, are there areas in the specification not addressed in the PWS to be considered and provided only for guidance information? NO If not, and the AUTEC is a mandatory requirement of the specification Solicitation, when will the follow-on specification be available?

The PWS and applicable documents will specify what work is required to be performed under the contract.

6. Reference paragraph 2.1.3.6.4.2 Submarine weapon tactical development exercises involving the launch of MK 48 and/or UK Spearfish torpedoes will typically involve 5 exercises per year. No test duration is listed for this test, nor is the number of torpedoes launched mentioned. Please provide the duration for an average test and the number of torpedoes anticipated for each test

The PWS will be modified to describe that Submarine weapon tactical development exercises typically launch about 6 weapons per test. Each of these tests typically take 12 hours.

7. Reference paragraph 2.1.3.6.4.3. "Weapon System Accuracy Trial (WSATs) Combat System Ship Trials (CSSQTs) include Sensor Accuracy tests and launching of weapons. (MK 48/ADCAP EXTORP/REXTORP, MK46 EXTORP/REXTORP, and MK 54 EXTORP. Typically, 1 WSAT/CSSQT is conducted each year. No test duration is listed for this test, nor is the number of torpedoes launched mentioned. Please provide the duration for an average test and the number of torpedoes launched.

The PWS will be modified to indicate the Navy's changing requirements.

8. You mentioned an upgrade for the SATCOM terminal from one T-1 to two T-1s, will this upgrade require further Microwave System upgrades?

No.

9. We were told that current security concerns do not allow contractor-controlled spaces to have SIPRNET; are there plans/needs to change this practice?

No plans for change at this time.

10. KIV-7 crypto equipment is currently installed in the Communications room at Andros's CCB; what are they used for?

AS3 datalink encryption between Site 1 and Site 2.

Used for encrypting Tsunami data between CCB and remote Range User location.

Contractor maintains and loads keymat.

11. At NOC building 1701 at Andros, it is apparent that facilities/system upgrades were ongoing; what do these upgrades consist of?

NOC building 1701 upgrades include: New A/C and back-up generator. The new A/C Chiller is redundant in case the primary fails.

12. At the CCB, FAA has a room marked Traffic Control Relay Station, does FAA use any of your SATCOM T-1 bandwidth?

No. The FAA uses the same satellite earth stations; however they do not use any of the available T-1 bandwidth. The FAA uses a separate 256K circuit.

13. Does AUTECH provide MK-48/ADCAP analysis for PCO weapons?

The AUTECH M&O Contractor provides placement analysis for PCO weapons. That analysis is necessary to answer one of the requirements of the Naval message that AUTECH produces (incl. whether Time-Of-Fire Placement is Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory).

PCO analysis support effort is somewhat less than typical SUBLANT Proficiency analysis support (per weapon) in that AUTECH: 1) does not monitor real-time as NUWC Code 80 personnel do that; and 2) AUTECH does not produce the systems analysis plots as they're not desired by the SUBLANT PCO School and its Instructors.

14. Are the AUTECH networks both at WPB and on Andros currently accredited? If so when do they expire?

Yes, the accreditation for the AUTECH unclassified Local Area Network for both WPB and ASD is DITSCAP (Department of Defense Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process). DITSCAP accreditation process is triennial and expires January 15 2006.

15. Do both government and contractor data reside in PeopleSoft? Are there any feeds to other systems and if so to what systems?

There is Contractor data only, at this time. However, there are plans to include several government systems such as Range Customer Billing. PeopleSoft is directly connected to the Spirent Gold Supply software.

16. Is data in PeopleSoft & Gold considered classified?

Much of PeopleSoft is considered contractor proprietary and is treated as sensitive information (ie: payroll and HR). Neither is classified.

17. What database platform is used to house the calibration laboratory equipment data and preventative maintenance schedule?

There is none at present; it is done manually thru an Excel spreadsheet. New systems are being investigated.

18. What database platform does Work Rooster run on?

Oracle 9i.

Engineer, Electrical/Electronics III-In-Water Systems Engineer. Please reference Amendment 0005, Section L34X Technical Proposal –Complex Item (Aug 2001), Subsection III Personnel, Paragraph (6), Page 9; and Amendment 0002, Attachment 3, Personnel Data Sheet, Pages 105-6. This key personnel position is interpreted to require senior Range Test Systems related project and test operations management experience, as well as in-water systems engineering experience. This PDF currently requires education and general professional experience with a “Bachelor’s level degree in Electrical/ Electronics Engineering with seven (7) years professional experience.” Will NUWC consider other technical or engineering degrees at the Bachelor’s or Master’s level for this position acceptable?

The RFP will be amended to include Engineering fields in: Electrical/Electronic, Chemical, Mechanical, Physics.

Will NUWC accept a specified additional minimum number of years of applicable general professional experience in addition to the seven (7) years currently specified as equivalent to a Bachelor's level degree in Electrical/Electronics Engineering?

No.

20. Information Technology. Please reference Amendment 0004, Attachment 17, AUTECH Technical Slides, Business and Customer Operations Team Presentation, Slide 12; and Draft Solicitation Attachment 2-Performance Work Statement (PWS), Chapter 1.3 Information Technology, Page 24 of 116. Slide 12 identifies “Information Technology” as a “M&O Counterpart” function under the contract in terms of “Software Engineering, Information Systems, Hardware Systems, and Network Systems.” PWS chapter 1.3 describes “Information Systems (IS)” as one of two major AUTECH IT areas, which “supports logistics and administration.”

What is the specific relationship between the “Information Technology” M&O counterpart function presented on slide 12 and the “Information Systems” work described in Chapter 1.3 of the PWS? Is it acceptable to perform any amount of the Information Technology and/or Information Systems services for the NUWC

Business and Customer Operations Team in the Newport, RI geographical area? How many of these specific Information Technology Personnel could be located in the Newport, RI geographical area?

Please clarify.

For AUTC, Information Technology consists of four major and distinct areas of expertise: Information Systems (unclassified business systems), Software Engineering (classified systems), Networks (both classified and unclassified), and Hardware (both classified and unclassified). In terms of this Contract, the Government is defining the Information Technology area in only two areas, for reporting purposes: Classified and Unclassified. As such, Information Systems would fall wholly under the Unclassified area. Currently, there are NO contractor personnel located in Newport in support of Information Technology, but the bidders must determine, on their own, what would work best for them. However, at this time the Government Information Technology counterpart is physically located in Newport.

AUTC DRAFT RFP ATTACHMENT 21 (AMENDMENT 0005)

21. Attachment 21, #2. – FAR 52.216-10, para. (e)(1) requires that “ the fee payable under this contract shall be target fee increased by _____ cents for every dollar that the total allowable cost is less than target cost or decreased by _____ cents for every dollar that the total allowable the total allowable cost exceeds the target cost.” Based on the parameters provided by the Navy (min. fee 0%, target fee 2.5%, max. fee 3.5%, low cost estimate 5% below target cost, and high cost estimate 5% above target cost) the Contractor could earn just 20 cents on every dollar of underrun while absorbing 50 cents in added cost on every dollar of overrun until reaching the respective 5% parameters. Request the Navy reconsider this formula, or permit Offerors to propose their own formula based on a range of incentive effectiveness deemed more appropriate to their particular technical and costing approach. Offerors could be cautioned that if their proposed CPIF approach is unsupported or unrealistic it would be considered an indicator of increased proposal risk.

The clause remains as written.

22. Attachment 21, #3. – Provision B52X provides a mechanism for CLIN 0001/0002 target cost to be divided into 6 semi-annual increments. Will the Navy compute semi-annual low and high cost estimates based on the 5% below or above target cost parameters mentioned above?

No – the offeror will fill in the blanks

What will be the process if the first five periods result in individual underruns that are greater than 5% and a sixth period that produces a compensating overrun?

There is no compensating process. Each six month period is evaluated separately.

Will there be an annual adjustment permitted based on proposed actuals or a single adjustment at the end of the initial 3 year performance period?

No adjustment will be allowed. Each six month period is evaluated separately

23. Attachment 21, #4. through #7. - The Navy’s answers to cited questions are not understood. If as stated in #7., the period of performance starts on 4/1/05 and continues for 36 months as indicated in provision BX18, the transition-in period must start 3 months earlier or 1/1/05, the projected date of contract award. The total combined time for transition-in and actual CLIN 0001/0002 performance would therefore be 39 months. If the Offeror elects to propose costs associated with transition-in (1/1/05 – 3/31/05) it would be inappropriate to propose and subsequently account for those costs against CLIN 0001/0002 (4/1/05 – 3/31/08). Even if the Offeror elects to not charge the Navy for transition-in activities, the cost must accounted for when incurred. In either event the Defense Contract Audit Agency would prefer these costs be clearly segregated . Request, therefore, that either a separate transition-in CLIN be established or the initial period of performance for CLIN 0001/0002 be redefined as 39 months.

The clause remains as written. There will be no separate CLIN for transition-in costs.

24. Attachment 21, #28. – Amendment 0004, Attachment 15 advised that “Offerors who are large businesses will have to submit subcontracting plans. The plan will only address small business participation in the subcontracting opportunities identified for work performed in the United States.” Please advise if the plan is to be restricted to the labor portion of PWS functions to be performed in CONUS.

The Small business subcontracting plan requirement only applies to work an offeror plans on subcontracting in the United States.

25. Attachment 21, #79 – We understand that it is the Navy’s prerogative to unilaterally determine whether or not to extend the contract via the award term mechanism. Request clarification whether the Navy intends to formally utilize available historical technical and cost performance data in the execution of the Award Term Plan.

The Government does not intend to formally utilize historical technical/cost performance data in the execution of the Award Term Plan.

26. Attachment 21, #121 – Will RFP Section H, Special Contract Requirements, contain provisions comparable to current contract Section H provisions addressing liability insurance (H-6), holidays (H-8), retail inventory (H-18) and contractor acquired capital assets (H-19/H-20)? Additionally, will Section H contain the provision entitled “Travel and Material Costs” referred to in the “Cost Summary Sheet”, Attachment 10?

Travel and Material Costs are cite in Clause L40.

27. Attachment 21. # 144 – The answer advises that BX18, Supplies/Services and Prices, has been revised to add 50% of estimated [food and] material cost to the award fee pool [cost] basis. BX18 states that for the purposes of determining the amount upon which award fee is to be calculated, Offerors are required to add 50% of the material costs cited in Clause L40, Cost Proposal, to their Target Cost for each respective three year period. (It should be noted with the issuance of Amendment 0005, that the total 3 year period material cost in the revised LX40 no longer matches the Food and Material CLIN amounts in the revised BX18.) The Target Cost (award fee pool cost basis) used for the planned award fee computation is the same as the Target Cost used for the Incentive Fee calculation. Please confirm that it is the Navy’s intent to add 50% of material costs cited in Clause L40 to Target Cost for the purpose of computing Target Incentive Fee and Maximum Incentive Fee required to complete the “Amount” column in BX18.

The Target Cost (award fee pool cost basis) used for the planned award fee computation is not the same as the Target Cost used for the Incentive Fee calculation. It is not the Government’s intent to add 50% of material costs cited in Clause L40 to Target Cost for the purpose of computing Target Incentive Fee and Maximum Incentive Fee required to complete the “Amount” column in BX18.

28. Attachment 21, #149 – This answer advises Offerors that with respect to provision L34X, that it is up to Offerors to determine whether, and to what degree it is necessary to address various elements of the PWS through individual technical responses. Will M32X, Evaluation for Award – Best Value, clearly delineate any elements of the PWS that are considered to differ one from the other in relative importance?

No

AUTEC DRAFT RFP SECTION H (Amendment 0005)

29. H100X, Advance Cost Agreement, para (g), G&A Cost Ceiling – This paragraph requires Offerors to propose a G&A ceiling rate for each “Fiscal Year”, 2005 through 2019. Since prices for CLIN 0001/0002, 0006/0007, etc. are being established for a three year period, is it the Navy’s intent to administer this G&A ceiling provision on that same basis and that any required cost adjustment will be made at the end of each three year period?

No. G&A rates proposed as ceilings by offeror’s will remain in effect for the base period of the contract as well as any award terms that are exercised.

30. H100X, Advance Cost Agreement, para (g), G&A Cost Ceiling – This paragraph effectively caps G&A for all 15 years of the contract. As noted in Attachment 21, #195, it is not possible to predict business conditions over that length of time. Request the Navy consider a more equitable scenario in which G&A rates are capped for the first 6 years (two 36 month performance periods) with a new G&A rate cap being negotiated in advance of each of the three remaining 36 month performance periods.

The clause remains as written.

AUTEC DRAFT RFP SECTION M32X (Amendment 0005)

31. Paragraph (C)(1) was modified to make reference to a “...partnership at the Base operation and Test Operation Team Leader levels and between the Information Technology function and the government counterpart.” Request you expand on what is meant by “IT function and government counterpart”. Does it mean for example that the government intends to establish a single lead/function for all IT (Test and IS)?

AUTEC is divided into 3 “Teams”: Base Operations, Test Operations, and Business/Customer Operations (BCO). The Information Technology group falls within the BCO Team. It is the only part of the BCO Team that is represented by a contractor “counterpart” and has performance goals associated with it. Therefore, like the Base Operations and the Test Operations Teams, IT must develop a partnership at this level with the Government IT counterpart, who is a single point-of-contact for IT.

32. Request you make available current metrics for the IT Help Desk. Based on recent history, for example, what types of calls are usually fielded and the percentage of each?

ASD Statistics Trouble Desk Calls for 2003

Month	Type of Trouble Desk Call				Total Calls
	VAX	IS	Software	Hardware	
January	2	8	36	30	76
February	1	6	22	18	47
March	0	11	40	29	80
April	0	15	26	26	67
May	0	11	43	15	69
June	1	11	35	25	72
July	2	15	46	29	92
August	0	1	49	30	80
September	2	3	42	15	62
October	1	5	43	15	64
November	1	2	25	9	37
December	0	4	25	11	40

WPB Statistics Trouble Desk Calls

Month	Type of Trouble Desk Call				Total Calls
	VAX	IS	Software	Hardware	
January	2	12	34	19	67
February	2	6	29	32	69
March	0	7	25	17	49
April	1	3	27	21	52
May	4	5	37	25	71
June	0	5	26	16	47
July	3	7	29	26	65
August	1	3	25	16	45
September	0	2	28	9	39
October	0	2	26	15	41
November	3	6	23	6	38
December	0	3	18	14	35

33. What systems are interfaced to the Peoplesoft ERP and what is used as the interface engine for each system, i.e., custom developed software, middleware, etc.?

Both custom developed software as well as GOLD Application Program Interfaces (API) are used.

34. RE PW TOOLS – What modules have been installed and what modules are being or are intended to be added prior to new contract start? (Blau)

Currently Installed

- WCWin - Work Control for Windows
- ESWin - Emergency Services for Windows
- PMWin - Preventive Maintenance for Windows
- DMWin - Design Management for Windows
- WebInfo - PW Web i8nfo

Scheduled to go to-line 3/04

- TMWin - Transportation Management for Windows

35. The Government has several computer networks supporting AUTEK operations at West Palm Beach and Andros Island. Please supply network topology diagrams showing interconnections, hardware and user interfaces that support the AUTEK contract.

AUTEK currently keeps 39 drawing sets (out of 43 buildings) of network related drawings. Each drawing set might include 5 pages of drawings and pictures. All drawing sets were created using Microsoft Visio Professional and are kept in the Visio format. These will be available in the Bidders Library.

36. Does the NUWC customer mandate compliance with National Security Telecommunications and Information Systems Security Policy (NSTISSP) No 11, as adopted by DoD D/CIO memo dated 6 August 2002?

This applies indirectly, AUTEK falls under the NUWCNPT firewall, and NUWCNPT is in charge of compliance.

37. Would the Government verify that, for the purposes of the cost evaluation, the investment required by non-incumbent offerers for aircraft, facilities and inventory will not place these offerers at a cost disadvantage?

The Government verifies that, for the purposes of the cost evaluation, the investment required by non-incumbent offerers for aircraft, facilities and inventory will not place these offerers at a cost disadvantage.

38. The Government stated that the disposal of the HazWaste stored in the Post Run facility for the MK46/48 exercise torpedoes was performed under subcontract. Is this subcontract the responsibility of the M&O contractor and if so, will the Government provide details on the associated costs, or provide a plug number for all bidders?

The cost associated with the Waste disposal for the OTTO Fuel is the responsibility of the In Service Engineering Agency (ISEA) Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division Keyport (NUWC DIVKPT). AUTEK's M&O is responsible informing the ISEA that a shipment is required and for transferring the waste into a IMO tanker that is provided by NUWVDIVKPT and for Compacting and canning the solid waste and properly placarding it per the applicable instructions.

39. Please provide details on the MK30 expendable countermeasures to include their availability through Federal Supply or vendor.

NA – One target has been modified to launch countermeasures to evaluate a Preliminary Engineering Change Proposal for NUWCDIV Newport. Following the successful demonstration of the dummy countermeasures' launches, the target will be put back into its original condition and the launcher hardware sent back to Newport. This feature is not part of, and has no bearing on, the RFP.

40. The Government stated that the MK30 maintenance management system is "home grown" and was developed by AUTECH. Site visitors did not have an opportunity to view the system. Please provide details of this system to include screen shots if possible.

Target PM is covered in the NAVSEA SW manuals which are referenced in the contract. The current contractor tracks these efforts using a paper system but the incumbent is free to use any system they desire as long as the work gets done.

41. The Government stated that the Excalibur system is currently under warranty for repairs. Please provide details of the warranty to include period of warranty and costs associated with labor or materials. The Excalibur ESM System (including the TS-300 Threat Simulator, pedestal, pedestal controller, and antennas/feeds) are under the manufacturer's warranty during the period of 01NOV 2003 until 31 OCT 2004. The manufacturer's warranty covers all labor and materials associated with system repair, we only pay for system shipping to the manufacturer. The amplifiers (two 70 Watt TWT units, currently used with the system), and all items after the warranty ends, will be maintained at the Government's expense by the M&O Contractor.

42. During the tour of 801 Clematis and the ensuing range scheduling discussion, the Government stated that they would entertain the idea of providing a draft Operational Directive. To provide the insight necessary to fully understand the process, request that the Government provide a sample Range Schedule, Test Plan and Operational Directive as well as details of the workings and associated screen shots of Work Rooster.

The documents requested will be made part of the bidder's library

(2) A list of site visit attendees:

N66604-04-R-0199: AUTECH Site Visit Attendee List		
Company	Visitor	Phone Number
1. Versar Inc.	Rankin, Dennis R.	(703)642-6746
2. The Cube Corporation	Bernhardt, Owen G.	(703)481-9101
	Stiefelmeyer, Jeni	
3. Nelson Engineering	Nelson, Blain L.	(321)269-1113
4. LockHeed Martin	Sohn, David	(856)810-5113
Waters, Michael K.	McLaury, Rodney E.	
	Wells, Brian A.	
5. Chugach Development Corp	Dickinson, Tonya	(907)550-4500
Hanofee, Martin J.	Babcock, Robert A.	
	Hellesto, Greg T.	
6. Jet Stream Ground Services	Norris, Mike	716-400-7176
	Norris, David	
7. RD Consulting, LLC	DeSimone Ralph Jr	(703)362-2086
8. ITT	Molyneaux, Paul D.	(719)637-5772
Schmidt, Spencer T.	Cook, Ronal B.	
	Diaz-Diaz, Richard	
9. Corrosion Correction, LLC	Parson, Phillip K.	(306)779-0915
10. KIRA	Bray, Michael S.	(830)608-3032
Hinton, Richard	Martina, Albert	
	Garcia, Carlos	
11. Analytical Solutions, Inc.	Sanford, Leslie McHenry	(540)663-2343
12. JWK International Corp	Gilmore, James F.	(703)608-6742
13. DynCorp Technical	Pace, Richard W.	(301)863-4836
Smith, George	Floyd Donald J. McLamb	
	Harris, William Jr	
14. QinetiQ	Waldron, Rodney	44(0) 239- 233- 4591
Michael, Andrew	Hiscock, Fabian	
McDonald, Ian	MacDonald, Murdo	

15. Cortez, Inc.	Maxwell, David G.	(703)434-6499
16. SAIC	Johnson, Richmond	(321)868-5726
Talipsky, Richard W.	Dean, Martin R.	
	Howell, Joseph	
17. Aerospace Testing Alliance	Coffman, Bert Uwe	(931)454-5891
18. Sverdrup	Purdy, Kenneth	(913)453-6400
Hickok, Louis	Pierre, Daniel	
19. MAR Inc.	Evans, Laura A.	301-230-4585
	Norcio, Michael P.	
20. Bionetics Corp	Perkins, Nathalie H.	757-873-0900 x219
21. L3 Communications TMA Corp	Oxford, Edward M.	(202)406-1300
	Wall, Lawrence L.	
22. AirScan Pacific Inc.	Candlish, Joseph M.	(321)639-0334
	Holloway, Walter F.	
23. Vertex Aerospace	Jardee, Todd L.	601-856-2274
	Orr, Kevin J.	
24. Raytheon	Wheeler, James C.	321-953-4611
	Hiner, Kent	
25. Guest Services	Lopez, Kenneth D.	(703)849-9372
26. AHNTech	Soo-Myung (Sam) Ahn	619-516-5900 x108